

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 77 are pending in the present application, of which Claims 1, 20, 39, 58, 63, 68 and 73 are the independent claims. With this paper, Applicant has amended Claims 20 to 23, 68, 69 and 73. No claims have been cancelled. No new claims have been added.

Initially, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for continued indication of allowance of Claims 1 to 19 and 39 to 67. In light of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, Applicant believes that all claims in the present application are in condition for allowance, for which prompt and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 68 to 77 were objected to because of informalities related to the use of “program code stored thereon” phrase.

With this paper, Applicant has amended Claim 68 to recite an apparatus wherein the processor is configured to perform a set of operations. Applicant believes that amended independent Claim 68, and Claims 69 to 72 that depend from Claim 68, are now clearly directed towards an apparatus and therefore are not directed to the same subject matter as Claims 73 to 77.

With this paper, Applicant has amended independent Claim 73 to recite a computer-readable medium comprising program codes for performing certain operations. Applicant believes that amended independent Claim 73, and Claims 74 to 77 that depend from Claim 73, are now clearly directed towards a computer-readable medium and therefore are not directed to the same subject matter as Claims 68 to 72.

Based on the above discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 68 to 77 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of objection to Claims 68 to 77 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 20 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

With this paper, Applicants have amended Claim 20 to recite, in relevant part, "means for filtering the estimated communication channel impulse response $\hat{h}_M(t)$ to generate a filtered estimate of the communication channel impulse response $h(t)$, the means for filtering selected at least in part according to the spreading sequence S_i ." Because each limitation of amended Claim 20 now recites "means for," Applicant believes that Claim 20 is in a proper means plus function form as required by 35 U.S.C. §112, sixth paragraph. Furthermore, Claims 21 to 38 depend from Claim 20 and are now also believed to be in a proper means plus function form, at least for the reasons presented with respect to Claim 20.

Based on the above discussion, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 20 to 38 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/28/09

By: 

Kenneth K. Vu, Reg. No. 46,323
Tel. (858) 658-5106

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 845-2505
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502